

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6057

tantly intimidating unfairness to a Senate witness.

The point to be stressed in all this is that good intentions are no substitutes for correct Federal procedures. For unless the constitutional rights of all of us—including, and even particularly including the Cohns and Levinsons, whatever their real or alleged sins—are kept safe, the rights of none of us can be guaranteed in the end.

The understandable and proper desire of Federal agents and prosecutors to enforce the law must not be further confused with the fateful duty of these agents and prosecutors to uphold something else called the Constitution of the United States.

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a vivid and heart-rending illustration of the conditions in South Vietnam is depicted in a feature article which was published in the February 16 issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register's "Picture" magazine.

It relates to the problems faced by Dr. Robert Norton, son of Prof. and Mrs. R. H. Norton, of Grinnell, Iowa.

In a letter to his parents, Dr. Norton wrote:

In our 30-bed postoperative ward we have . . . one patient to a bed with sheets. In our other wards we have two or three patients to a wooden bed with a straw mat . . . Bob Edwards and I have between 200 and 300 patients and 148 beds at our disposal.

His story is that of war at its worst. It is this war which we must take into consideration in the midst of all this talk of uncertain policy in South Vietnam. It is this war we must face up to. Inconsistent, wavering policies which seem to be the rule of thumb nowadays will not lessen these conditions and problems.

It is heartening to see how Dr. Norton sums up his role in South Vietnam. I should like to quote the pertinent paragraph:

We're doing something vital here. Not just medically. When a Vietnamese, coming out of shock, sees an American trying to save him, the "Ugly American" myth crumbles a bit more.

That one thought makes all our efforts worth while.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, entitled "An Iowa Doctor in Vietnam," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN IOWA DOCTOR IN VIETNAM

"I didn't go into medicine to stay in one part of the world and make money while people on the other side bleed to death," said Dr. Robert Norton of Grinnell recently.

That he meant what he said was obvious, for he was speaking in a crowded hospital in the South Vietnam town of Can Tho, halfway around the world from Iowa.

Dr. Norton went to Vietnam in 1963 as a member of the U.S. operations mission. Can Tho is 80 miles south of Saigon in the Mekong River delta, a huge waterlogged battleground for Communist-led Vietcong guerrillas and South Vietnam troops equipped, trained and advised by U.S. military personnel. The war they wage is a war of ambush, of hit-and-run fighting.

The Vietcong does not limit its attacks to military outposts. In terrorist raids on villages the guerrillas seize weapons and food,

then use the threat of similar raids to extort more from other villages. Eighty percent of South Vietnam's battle casualties are civilians; caring for those brought to the hospital at Can Tho is the job of Dr. Norton and an American colleague, Dr. Robert Edwards. These pictures, which appeared recently in Look magazine, show the 33-year-old Iowan in the hospital.

"Sometimes," said Dr. Norton, "an entire village is carried in at once. Most of our cases are 'difficult.' That means they're apt to die."

In a recent letter to his parents, Prof. and Mrs. R. H. Norton of Grinnell, Dr. Norton wrote that "the majority of patients we see are war casualties. My patients are almost all Vietnamese. We also take care of the American civilians in town. This is, of course, mostly general practice. If there are casualties in the immediate area among the Americans, we see them and send them on unless we think they would not live to reach Saigon. So far we have just had to operate on two."

Even without combat injuries, there are plenty of civilian medical problems, as the letter explains:

"We see a lot of typhoid fever with holes in the bowel and peritonitis; diphtheria needing tracheotomies, appendicitis where the appendix has been perforated for days, trapped hernias, wombs torn during delivery . . . and far advanced cancer. When we do not have emergencies, we do elective surgery.

"In our 30-bed postoperative ward we have . . . one patient to a bed with sheets. In our other wards we have two or three patients to a wooden bed with a straw mat. Bob Edwards and I have between 200 and 300 patients and 148 beds at our disposal."

Dr. Norton was born in Grinnell and was graduated from Grinnell College, where his father is a professor of history. He was graduated from Harvard Medical School in 1958, interned at Iowa Methodist Hospital in Des Moines and then spent 4 years there as a resident surgeon. His wife, Jo, whom he met in Denver on a cross-country bird-watching trip, and their three children—Sean, 5; Tad, 4; and Sharon, 2—are with him in Can Tho, which itself is often the target of Vietcong terrorists.

Dr. Norton sees his role in Vietnam as more than that of a physician, even a very dedicated one. "We're doing something vital here," he told a recent visitor. "Not just medically. When a Vietnamese, coming out of shock, sees an American trying to save him, the 'Ugly American' myth crumbles a bit more."

WESTERN TRADE WITH THE COMMUNIST BLOC

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., a correspondent for the New York Times in Washington, wrote a very scholarly article on the dispute between the United States and its allies over Western trade with the Communist bloc, which appeared in the March 1 issue.

He penetrates beneath the surface to pinpoint the differences among the Western nations in approaches to the trade question.

Mr. Dale draws the conclusion that it is unlikely that those nations will change their thinking or their policies on trade with the bloc. And he believes that the United States will continue to stand alone on several aspects, and, as he puts it, "will continue to get meager results."

He feels, and somehow I must agree with him, that:

In any case, the political debate will continue and allied nerves will continue to be rasped from time to time. But there is some reason to suspect that much of the debate, and the dispute, is now more for the record than anything else, and that the basic situation is an "agreement to disagree."

I think very much implied in that statement is that the United States cannot be successful in its semieconomic warfare if it declines to take a firm position, as I said earlier in my remarks regarding the speech of the Senator from Arkansas, that any statements this Nation may make are for public edification—an attempt to make the American public believe that the administration wants to do something about the problem.

Mr. Dale says:

This situation is bound to be frustrating—a frustration likely to find its most acute expression in Congress rather than in the White House or the State Department.

On this, I agree. The Congress appears to be the only one to be greatly concerned about the matter. It is too bad because the image in the world mind of our policies is one of inconsistency and confusion.

But despite this, Mr. Dale does not feel that the NATO alliance, founded on reasons of mutual self-protection, is in any danger of breaking up. This probably is very true but it does nothing in projecting a clear picture of firm leadership on our part.

Our failure to take a firm and concrete position in the blockade of Cuba has resulted in a negation of our avowed aim to break Castro to his knees economically.

This is shown in a New York Times article of March 1.

The lead paragraph of that article by Juan de Onis tells the story.

The economy of Cuba has taken the Sunday punch of the U.S. commercial and financial blockade and is still on its feet.

In that connection I believe the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas earlier this afternoon were very appropriate, when he pointed out that the public should not get its hopes up high about Castro being brought to his knees.

Parenthetically, I should add that that "Sunday punch" has been no more than a slight tap.

This failure results in Castro, as set out in the Times of today, being able to ridicule the United States in our economic blockade efforts.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles, entitled "Dispute Grows Over Western Trade With the Communist Bloc," "Castro Presses the West for Expanded Trade," and "Castro Ridicules United States on Blockade," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 29, 1964]

DISPUTE GROWS OVER WESTERN TRADE WITH THE COMMUNIST BLOC

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 29.—Almost since the beginning of the cold war there has been a running disagreement between the United